## ENVIRONMENTAL TOBACCO SMOKE

- Get scientists who are against us on the primary issue to speak up in our favor on the ETS issue. There are probably quite a number of scientists who would be ready to do this - Wynder is an example. These people should address scientific meetings, conduct interviews with the media, appear on talk shows, etc. We should attempt to arrange debates between these scientists and the more rabid or silly antis.

- We should identify celebrities or well-known spokespersons, who are not scientists, who will appear on television, to give media interviews, etc. and explain the other side of the story on ETS. They can be negative on the primary issue - this will help their credibility and balance the fact that we are paying them. On the latter point, we should push the notion that these people are of such stature that they cannot be corrupted by receiving a few thousand dollars from the tobacco industry; the same would apply to the scientists referred to above. Also, we should attempt to get some high-powered spokespersons or reputable scientists to do the job for nothing - this may not be impossible.

- The whole area of risk assessment is considered to be arcane and very unreliable by many reputable scientists and researchers. We must mount a major effort to challenge the methods used to assess risks.

- We must become more effective at challenging the statistics used against us on both the primary and ETS issues.

- The Meta analysis method is considered by many scientists to be a very questionable technique. We should attempt to find a way of challenging the accuracy and reliability of the Meta analysis technique.

- We should hire the best epidemiologists and statisticians we can find and have them analyze the underlying data and methodology used in the studies that show ETS to be a problem to the non-smoker. We must find ways of legally forcing investigators to give us their underlying data and explain their methodology. It seems reasonable to me that, if an investigator is not ready to disclose his underlying data and explain his methodology, then the study should be excluded from the discussion on ETS; we should push this position.

- We must become more effective in using our "truth in science" approach. We should develop an action plan, at the earliest possible date, to accomplish this objective.

- We have several people in the company who are skilled at appearing on T.V. - we should use them more. We have Chuck Wall, Steve Parrish, John Dollisson and others.

2021181949

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/nsgj0000

- We must do more to push the Accommodation approach. An action plan should be developed on this at the earliest possible date.

- We should step up our efforts to locate studies on ETS that have been suppressed because they came out the wrong way. We should especially try to identify studies that have been paid for with the taxpayers' money.

- We should do more to publicize our new position on the primary issue. This will help our credibility with our ETS position.

- We should make a major commitment to biomedical research. This will greatly improve our credibility. It will also give PM a close relationship with leading people in the medical research establishment - this has got to be helpful generally and may help us on the ETS problem.

- We should make sure that our ETS unit is staffed by the best people that we can find. Steve Parrish should evaluate each member of his team and give RWM a recommendation, by the end of September 1990, as to whether or not anyone on his team should be replaced.

- It is my belief that we must do better at coordinating our efforts with the work being done by the Tobacco Institute, John Rupp, the PM Washington office, the CIAR and the competitors.

- Evaluate the work being done by CIAR. Is it worthwhile continuing this organization? If it is worthwhile continuing with CIAR, how can we use the organization to further our objectives on the ETS issue?

- A large amount of money has been spent on the ETS issue in recent years. Rupp has done a lot of work. We have sponsored seminars and had scientists make presentations at seminars and scientific meetings. Can we get some payback in the years ahead from these expenditures?

2021191850

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/nsgj0000